

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The foregoing amendment and the following arguments are provided to impart precision to the claims, by more particularly pointing out the invention, rather than to avoid prior art.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7-9, 12, 14, and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,999,997 (hereinafter "Pipes") in view of U.S. Patent 6,128,661 (hereinafter "Flanagin").

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). (Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) ¶ 2143.03).

Independent claims 1, 12, and 17 of the present application include limitations not disclosed or taught by Pipes in view of Flanagin. As a result, claims 1, 12, and 17 are patentable over Pipes in view of Flanagin.

In particular, applicant's claims, as amended, include the limitation, or a limitation similar there to, of:

An electronic device comprising:

**a housing to enable the device to be docked into a notebook computer having a memory to store a first operating system and exclusive of a central processing unit (CPU);**

**a CPU to operate as a system processor of the notebook computer when the device is docked and to operate as a system CPU of the device when the device is undocked.. (emphasis added). (Applicant's claim 1).**

Neither Pipes nor Flanagin, however, disclose nor suggest the limitation of a CPU in an apparatus to serve as a CPU in a system, exclusive of a CPU, when docked in the system, and serve as the CPU of the apparatus when undocked from the system, as claimed by applicant. In particular, Pipes discloses:

In general, in one aspect, the invention features a first computer for use with a second computer. **The second computer has a second bus and a second central processing unit that runs a second operating system that provides a user interface. The first computer has a first bus for connection to the second bus and a first central processing unit . . . (Pipes, Summary).**

Therefore, in view of applicant's independent claims including limitations that are not disclosed nor suggested by Pipes nor Flannigan, applicant's independent claims are patentable over Pipes in view of Flanagin.

In addition, the remaining claims depend from one of the independent claims as discussed above, and therefore include similar limitations, and as a result are also patentable over Pipes in view of Flanagin.


CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call John Ward at (408) 720-8300, x237.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

  
John P. Ward  
Reg. No. 40,216

Date: 2/17/04

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300